**Mawyer, Denise T.**

**From:** Walk, Roger A.
**Sent:** Thursday, August 03, 2000 11:03 AM
**To:** Putney, Rebecca M.
**Subject:** Sanders - Follow up on switchers

Sanders - follow-up

-----Original Message-----
**From:** Sanders, Edward
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 02, 2000 8:09 AM
**To:** Walk, Roger A.
**Subject:** RE: Input on TES from Boston meeting

Roger,

Your explanation is quite clear. First of all, I am aware of Dr. Burns' views on the different characteristics of low tar smokers. He was one of the two reviewers of Peter's manuscript on low tar that was submitted to the BMJ, and he made these views quite clear. When I return to Neuchâtel (soon, I am happy to say) I will fax a copy of that review to you. Of course, at the same time he states that such smokers are different, yet they compensate. These two views are almost mutually exclusive. I don't think that Dr. Burns' suggestion should be taken into account during the pilot study. However, for the full TES, we probably do need to look into this. The second bullet point is far more important than the first bullet point. The question is, what differences should we be looking for? I think that this point needs some discussion, and perhaps such discussion should include Dr. Burns (if possible). Since we have some time to do so, let's do it.

Thanks.

Ted

-----Original Message-----
**From:** **Walk, Roger A.**
**Sent:** 2 août 2000 06:46
**To:** Sanders, Edward
**Subject:** RE: Input on TES from Boston meeting

You are absolutely right. I gave you insufficient information to make any sense. Sorry.

So here are the issues:

- Dr. Burns (during the Boston meeting with Conolly et al.) wondered whether we would consider a longitudinal element in the cross-sectional TES design. He expressed interest in a follow-up of those participants who after they had delivered samples for biomarkers, switched to another lower tar brand. He suggested to collect another set of samples after a couple of months on the 'new' brand from those (rare) individuals.
- Dr. Burns expressed his belief that smokers of different tar sections are 'different' with regard to their behavior (this is actually reflected by the significantly different demographics in different tar bands.). In order to capture such group characteristics he suggested to collect complete smoking histories including cessation efforts in order to characterize the 'smoking type' as a potential confounder.

I hope this makes some sense to you now. Is there anything in this we should consider for the TES?

Regards,
Roger

-----Original Message-----
**From:** Sanders, Edward
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 01, 2000 8:58 AM
**To:** Walk, Roger A.
**Subject:** RE: Input on TES from Boston meeting

Roger,



PM3006856527

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/yrlx0001

I would be glad to follow-up on your request; however, at this point I am not quite certain as to what you want. It would seem to me that what is being asked is to ensure that if we sample the same individuals three times that we identify those individuals who have switched brands (or perhaps more to the point, tar levels) between sampling times. If this is what is needed, the solution is quite simple; namely, to ask for brand identification before each sampling. If more than this is needed, please let me know. Of course, for those individuals who have switched, which should not be many, one must decide as to what action to take. I would see two choices. The first would be to simply drop them. The second would be to move them to the new group.

Best regards.

Ted

-----Original Message-----
**From:** **Walk, Roger A.**
**Sent:** 30 juillet 2000 02:04
**To:** Tricker, Anthony; Nelson, Bettie L; Sanders, Edward; Jones, Jan (MDF); Kinser, Robin D.; von Holt, Klaus; Gomm, Willy
**Subject:** FW: Input on TES from Boston meeting

Dear All,

Please find below the input from the scientists and public health representatives in Massachusetts last Tuesday. We should discuss these suggestions during our design meeting on August 7/8. In order to prepare this could:

- Tony look into bullet #1, nitrosoproline;
- Bettie and W. Gomm into the normal/not-normal distribution issue;
- Bettie into a better exclusion of occasional smokers than '< 1 cig./day' (the concern is for those smokers, who do not smoke at all and then once in a while including shortly before our sampling 3 cigarettes in a day);
- Ted into whether we should consider a follow-up of switchers; and
- all whether we should add to ask for the smoking history beyond a few weeks including cessation attempts.

Thanks for your contributions.
Roger

-----Original Message-----
**From:** Walk, Roger A.
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 26, 2000 5:24 PM
**To:** Podraza, Ken F.; Hsu, Frank; Cox, Richard H.; Solana, Rick P.
**Subject:** Input on TES from Boston meeting

Dear All,

Do you have recollection of any other input on our study design from the group in Boston yesterday than the ones listed below?

The following suggestions were made on the current study design:

- Determine nitrosoproline (Hoffmann);
- Follow up on subjects which have switched brand after first biomarker analysis (Burns);
- Consider other than normal distributed data for calculation of sample size (Burns);
- Call biomarkers of potential health effects also biomarkers of toxicity (Burns);
- Sputum may provide unreliable sample material (Hoffmann);
- Ask for smoking history to identify 'types of smokers' (Burns)
- Ask for cessation efforts in smoking history (Burns);
- Exclude occasional smokers with uneven cigarette consumption over time from non-tobacco user group (Burns);
- Use of PalmPilot handheld computer for diary data collection (Burns).



PM3006856528

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/yrlx0001

I appreciate your help to collect all input for further evaluation/discussion.

Regards,
Roger



PM3006856529

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/yrlx0001